

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BERNADINE BABIEN AVILA,

Plaintiff,

-against-

HILTON GRAND VACATIONS,

Defendants.

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC # _____
DATE FILED: March 18, 2020

20-CV-2281 (ER)

ORDER OF SERVICE

EDGARDO RAMOS, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff brings this *pro se* action under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (“ADEA”), 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 to 634; the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA), 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 to 2654; the New York State Human Rights Law, N.Y. Exec. Law §§ 290 to 297; and the New York City Human Rights Law, N.Y.C. Admin. Code §§ 8-101 to 131. Plaintiff alleges that her former employer discriminated against her based on her age by terminating her employment while she was on FMLA leave. By order dated March 17, 2020, the Court granted Plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

DISCUSSION

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, she is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) (“The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)). Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that the summons and complaint be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the summons and complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that a summons be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summons is

issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff's responsibility to request an extension of time for service); *see also Murray v. Pataki*, 378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) (“As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals’ failure to effect service automatically constitutes ‘good cause’ for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule 4(m).”).

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendant Hilton Grand Vacations through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form (“USM-285 form”) for this defendant. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue a summons and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon this defendant.

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if her address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff, together with an information package.

The Clerk of Court is further instructed to complete the USM-285 form with the address for Defendant Hilton Grand Vacations and deliver to the U.S. Marshals Service all documents necessary to effect service.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 18, 2020
New York, New York



EDGARDO RAMOS
United States District Judge

DEFENDANT AND SERVICE ADDRESS

1. Hilton Grand Vacations
1335 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019